

REMARKS

Objections to the drawings

The drawings have been objected to because they do not include the reference sign "17" as was mentioned in the description on page 4, lines 10 and 15. The description has been amended and element 17 is no longer mentioned. Therefore, Applicants believe the objection to the drawings is now moot and replacement drawing sheets are not required.

Objections to the disclosure

The disclosure has been objected to because the numeral 17 was used to identify two different elements on page 4, at lines 10 and 15. Applicants have amended the appropriate paragraphs, and, as a result, numeral 17 is no longer present in the disclosure. In view of these amendments, Applicants believe the objections have been rendered moot.

At page 4, line 10, Applicants inadvertently referred to the shelf 32 as "shelf 17." The disclosure has been amended to recite a shelf 32. As Fig. 2 shows, a shelf 32 extends beneath the container 20 on either side of its neck 21.

At page 4, line 15, Applicants inadvertently referred to the shoulders of shelf 32 as "shoulders 17." The disclosure has been amended to recite the shoulders of shelf 32. As Fig. 2 shows and as is discussed on page 4, lines 10-11, a shelf 32 may be in the form of a pair of shoulders that extend beneath the container 20 on either side of its neck 21.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because there is no antecedent basis for the recited "said flange." Applicants appreciate the Examiner's observation that "said flange" should be "said flanges", and claim 4 has been amended accordingly.

Nonstatutory double patenting rejections

Claims 2-5 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of copending Application No. 10/692,906. Although current office records may show the referenced application as "abandoned", Applicants

intend to seek a revival of the reference application and will therefore respond to the nonstatutory double patenting rejections.

A "Terminal Disclaimer to Obviate a Provisional Double Patenting Rejection Over a Pending 'Reference' Application", PTO/SB/25, is filed with this response to overcome the rejection. Applicants have included a check in the amount of \$130.00 to cover the terminal disclaimer fee under 37 CFR 1.20(d).


Claims 6 and 7 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In view of the terminal disclaimer, Applicants believe the objections to claims 6 and 7 have become moot.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, a Notice of Allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing in more detail, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

In the event that any fees are due with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 18-0987.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Weber, Reg. No. 46,069
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber
First National Tower - Fourth Floor
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456
Telephone: (330) 376-1242
Facsimile: (330) 376-9646
Attorney for Applicant(s)

May 27, 2008